

as fillers. However, Butler fails to teach that the LAB coated film surface is visually uniform. The Examiner further states that Zhu discloses a coating composition of LAB comprising colloidal silica dispersion wherein the particle size can be larger and will not diminish LAB properties but changes the visual properties. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize Zhu's teaching of using large size silica particles in LAB in the invention of Butler to obtain visual uniformity of the film surface.

Applicants understand Butler as teaching a process for a coating that is a non-reproducible random coating, much like an orange peel effect. Butler obtains splotchy patterned coatings. The "pattern" is unpredictable and non-reproducible, although the coating conditions may be reproduced. Furthermore, what Butler is creating is a microscopic pattern, which is difficult to see (note that the images are SEMS at 50X magnification).

Applicants understand Zhu as teaching the use of colloidal silica in the range of 1 nanometer to 1 micrometer, with a preferred range of 7 to 75 nanometers. Furthermore, Zhu uses silica to improve the abrasion resistance of his coatings (1-12, 2-15, 5-5, etc.).

It appears that Zhu does not measure the optical properties of his coatings, although they are described as "transparent, translucent, or opaque" (Col. 5, Ln 29). Zhu is particularly concerned with the transmissive properties (i.e., degree of transparency) of the cured coatings. This is in contrast to the reflective properties of the present invention, wherein the visual appearance of the film (reflective properties) is what is being claimed, and not whether or not one can view through the film (transmissive properties).

Neither Butler nor Zhu describe how to coat a film with an LAB, such that the film has the appearance of a uniform film, that is the viewer is unable to distinguish between the coated and uncoated macroscopic portions of the film. Uniformity of microscopic portions of the films is not what is being claimed. Butler does not make the present invention obvious and the combination with Zhu, contrary to the Examiner's position, does not cure the shortcomings of Butler.

Applicants respectfully suggest that the rejections based on Butler in view of Zhu are improper and all such rejections should be withdrawn.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 5-6, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler in view of Zhu and Blackwell (5,401,547).

As stated above, the Butler – Zhu combination fails. The addition of Blackwell does not cure this failure. Merely using two different LABs, as in Blackwell, still does not make the use of two different LABs in the present invention obvious. Blackwell describes a fully coated film using two different LABs (for different adhesion levels). However, Blackwell (as well as Butler and Zhu) does not describe or even suggest how to deal with the LAB coated portion of a film and an uncoated portion of the film. Since Blackwell never deals with this issue, there is no suggestion of a modification of the coatings to solve the problem of this interface. Therefore, there is no expectation of success and this combination also fails.

Applicants respectfully suggest that the rejections based on Butler in view of Zhu and Blackwell are improper and all such rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully suggest this paper is fully responsive to the Office Action and the remarks and amendments have resolved the Examiner's outstanding objections and rejections. However, if after fully considering Applicants' response, there are issues remaining, Applicants request the Examiner telephone the undersigned to timely resolve any remaining issues.

Please charge any fees that may be associated with this paper to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4 September 2001

By: Carolyn V. Peters  
Carolyn V. Peters  
Registration No. 33,271

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
P.O. Box 33427  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427  
Telephone: (651) 736-7929  
Facsimile: (651) 736-3833